UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,206	03/12/2007	Laurent Bournay	PET-2242	7112
23599 7590 04/15/2010 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, TAM M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@mwzb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/579,206	BOURNAY ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	TAM M. NGUYEN	1797		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 M This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 12 May 2006 is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 12 ☐ The	er election requirement. er. ⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to b drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
,—		, teller er remm + e + re =		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/12/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expression "an effluent (C) that is enriched with multi-branched paraffins is recovered" in lines 5-6 of claim 1 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear if the effluent is from the isomerization unit.

The expression "a mixture of this hydrocarbon" in line 6 from the last line of claim 1, renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what hydrocarbon mixture Applicants intent to claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 10/579,206 Page 3

Art Unit: 1797

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zarchy et al. (US 5,245,102) in view of Ragil et al. (US 6,156,950).

Zarchy discloses an isomerization process wherein a feedstock comprising normal paraffins, benzene, and iso-paraffins wherein at least a portion of the feedstock after separation of at least a portion of branched paraffins is introduced into an isomerization zone to increase branching of hydrocarbons of the feedstock. An effluent from the isomerization zone is charged to a stabilizer to separate C_4 and lighter hydrocarbons from the effluent which is then passed into a deisohexanizer to produce an overhead stream comprising normal pentane, isopentane, and dibranched C_6 paraffins and a bottom stream containing C_7 branched paraffins, cyclohexane, and napthalenes. The overhead stream is then passed into an adsorption zone to separate normal pentane from isopentane and di-branche C_6 paraffins. The normal pentane is recycled back to the isomerization zone. Zarchy further teaches that the feedstock is introduced at least in part at the

Art Unit: 1797

stabilizer. See abstract; Figure 1, col. 3, line 60 through col. 5, line 26; col. 10, line 54 through col. 12, line 28. Table 1,

Zarchy does not disclose a step of using a membrane unit as claimed.

Ragil disclose a process for separation normal paraffins from branched paraffins by utilizing a membrane unit. Ragil further teaches that a membrane unit such disclosed by WO 96/01687 and EP-778075 can be employed. The WO reference teaches a membrane comprising a MFI zeolite and ions (e.g., Na) and it is a nanocrystallized membrane. The EP reference teaches that the membrane can be base on a LTA-type zeolite. See col.4, line 50 through col. 5, line 25; col. 9, line 66 through col. 10, line 50.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Zarchy by utilizing a membrane unit as suggested by Ragil because the membrane unit is simple and operated continuously compared to an adsorption unit.

Ragil does not specifically teach that the membrane comprises polymer.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Ragil by utilizing a membrane comprising polymer because it is within the level one of skill in the art to use any effective membrane including a membrane comprising polymer.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over references as applied to claim 1 above alone or alternatively and further in view of Rice (US 6,395,950 B1).

Zarchy does not specifically teach that the deisohexane is a partition column.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process the process of Zarchy by utilizing a partition column because it is known that a partition column is effective to produce at least three different output streams.

Alternatively, Rice teaches a partition column for separation a mixture of paraffins. See abstract; Figure 1.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the process of Zarchy by utilizing a partition column as suggested by Rice because such column is effective to separate the mixture into three different streams and it is an advantage to use a partition column in term of capital investment.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAM M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Caldarola can be reached on (571) 272-1444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/579,206 Page 6

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tam M. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 1797

TN

/Tam M. Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797